

**BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

---

IN THE MATTER OF THE       )  
INVESTIGATION OF INTER-    )  
JURISDICTIONAL ISSUES       )  
AFFECTING PACIFICORP DBA    )  
UTAH POWER & LIGHT CO.      )

---

CASE NO. PAC-E-02-3  
  
DIRECT TESTIMONY  
OF ANDREA L. KELLY

**SEPTEMBER 2003**

1    **Q.    Please state your name, business address and position with PacifiCorp or “the**  
2           **Company”.**

3    A.    My name is Andrea L. Kelly. My business address is 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite  
4           300, Portland, Oregon 97232. I am employed by PacifiCorp as Managing Director,  
5           Strategic Projects.

6    **Qualifications**

7    **Q.    Please summarize your education and business experience.**

8    A.    I hold a Bachelor’s degree in Economics from the University of Vermont and an MBA in  
9           Environmental and Natural Resource Management from the University of Washington.  
10          After graduate school, I joined the Staff of the Washington Utilities and Transportation  
11          Commission (WUTC) as a Rate Research Specialist. In 1995, I became employed by  
12          PacifiCorp as a Senior Pricing Analyst in the Regulation Department and advanced  
13          through positions of increasing responsibility. Since 2000, I have been assigned to Major  
14          Projects with a focus on resolving the Company’s inter-jurisdictional allocation  
15          challenges.

16   **Q.    Have you appeared as a witness in previous regulatory proceedings?**

17   A.    Yes, I have submitted testimony on behalf of PacifiCorp in the states of Oregon and  
18          Washington. In addition, I sponsored testimony in various proceedings as a member of  
19          the Staff of the WUTC.

20   **Purpose of Testimony**

21   **Q.    Please identify Exhibit No. 3.**

22   A.    Exhibit No. 3 is the PacifiCorp Inter-jurisdictional Cost Allocation Protocol (“Protocol”)  
23          that the Company is requesting that the Commission ratify in this proceeding. Appendix

1 A to the Protocol is a list of defined terms. For purposes of greater clarity and  
2 consistency, when I capitalize terms in my direct testimony, it is intended that those terms  
3 have the same meaning as provided for in Appendix A to the Protocol. Also attached to  
4 the Protocol are Appendix B, identifying the allocation factors applied to each component  
5 of the revenue requirement calculation, and Appendix C, the algebraic derivation of each  
6 allocation factor. Appendix B and C are also included as Exhibits to Mr. Taylor's direct  
7 testimony and he is the witness sponsoring these issues.

8 **Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony?**

9 A. The purpose of my testimony is to describe in general terms the basis and content of the  
10 Company's proposed "MSP Solution" as incorporated in the Protocol. The direct  
11 testimony of Mr. Duvall and Mr. Taylor provide a detailed explanation of the various  
12 elements of the Protocol including computations of the allocation factors and projections  
13 of the expected revenue requirement impact of adopting the MSP Solution. My direct  
14 testimony does not deal with the proposed allocation of transmission costs and revenues,  
15 distribution costs and administrative and general expense because those topics are fully  
16 covered by Mr. Taylor's direct testimony.

17 **Background of MSP Solution**

18 **Q. How does the MSP Solution correspond to the "Dynamic" and "Hybrid" Proposals**  
19 **that Messrs. MacRitchie and Duvall reference in their direct testimony?**

20 A. The MSP Solution contains elements of both the Dynamic and Hybrid Proposals as well  
21 as some new concepts.

22 **Q. How did the Company go about formulating the MSP Solution?**

1 A. There were widely divergent views expressed during the course of the MSP. However, it  
2 appeared that all MSP participants shared the belief that the ultimate resolution of MSP  
3 issues should be based upon principles of sound public policy and should not be a result  
4 of "horse trading" aimed only at achieving an agreeable short-term economic outcome.  
5 Therefore, in formulating the MSP Solution, we sought to harmonize, as best as we were  
6 able, the principle-based positions taken by the various MSP participants.

7 **Q. Does that mean that MSP participants were unconcerned about customer price**  
8 **impacts?**

9 A. By no means. It seemed to be generally understood and agreed that the MSP should not  
10 result in a disproportionate cost shift among States.

11 **Q. What other principles formed the basis for the MSP Solution?**

12 A. It seemed to be generally recognized that a resolution to MSP issues should:

- 13 a) promote economic efficiency;
- 14 b) be equitable to PacifiCorp's customers and shareholders;
- 15 c) allow individual States to pursue policy initiatives without burdening customers in
- 16 other States;
- 17 d) permit continued effective regulatory oversight; and
- 18 e) not impede the provision of safe, adequate and reliable service by the Company.

19 While these principles enjoyed broad support, there is a tension among them. In addition,  
20 MSP participants had differing views regarding the appropriate balance of policy  
21 considerations.

22 **Q. Please provide an example of this tension.**

1 A. An element of the principle of promoting continued effective regulatory oversight is  
2 formulating a proposal that is relatively simple and reasonably understandable to  
3 customers. However, formulating a proposal that is responsive to individual State policy  
4 preferences inevitably increases complexity. The trick is striking the appropriate balance  
5 between these two important policy objectives.

6 **Q. Does the Company believe that the MSP Solution furthers each of the policy**  
7 **principles that you listed previously?**

8 A. Yes.

9 **Q. How does the MSP Solution promote economic efficiency?**

10 A. Under the MSP Solution, the Company will continue to plan and operate its system on an  
11 integrated basis with the objective of minimizing total costs to our customers. While  
12 under the MSP Solution certain resources are deemed to be assigned or allocated to some  
13 States, and not others, for ratemaking purposes, this should not create inappropriate  
14 incentives for efficient system planning or operation. Indeed, under prior allocation  
15 methods, the Company has been assigning certain resources to only some States for the  
16 last 14 years without affecting system planning or operations.

17 **Q. Is the MSP Solution equitable from both a customer and shareholder perspective?**

18 A. Yes. From a customer perspective, we believe that the MSP Solution will cause each  
19 State to reasonably support the costs they are imposing on PacifiCorp's system. Mr.  
20 Taylor's direct testimony describes the empirical basis for the various allocation factors  
21 underlying the Protocol. We are mindful of the concerns of some States that the expected  
22 higher load growth in Utah is being subsidized by slower-growing States. However,  
23 analyses conducted during the MSP appeared to demonstrate that Load-Based Dynamic

1 Allocation Factors are effective in shifting costs to faster-growing States. Mr. Duvall and  
2 Mr. Taylor's direct testimony describe these analyses. Additionally, the MSP Solution  
3 contemplates that the costs of certain Seasonal Resources are allocated in a manner that  
4 better reflects that seasonal usage. This ensures that summer peaking states bear a higher  
5 proportion of the costs of summer resources and that winter peaking states bear a higher  
6 proportion of the costs of winter resources.

7 From a shareholder perspective, the MSP Solution is equitable because it should  
8 afford the Company a reasonable opportunity to recover 100 percent of its prudently  
9 incurred costs, without any short-fall arising from inconsistent inter-jurisdictional cost  
10 allocation methods.

11 **Q. How does the MSP Solution allow individual States to pursue policy initiatives**  
12 **without burdening customers in other States?**

13 A. The MSP Solution accommodates individual State policy initiatives in a number of  
14 respects. For example:

- 15 a) it permits a State to adopt a Direct Access Program without shifting costs to other  
16 States;
- 17 b) it permits each State to invest in the level of Demand-Side Management Programs it  
18 deems appropriate;
- 19 c) it permits each State to adopt Portfolio Standards without unreasonably shifting costs  
20 to other States;
- 21 d) it permits States to afford industrial customers discounts which support economic  
22 development without shifting costs to other States;

- 1 e) it permits States in the Pacific Northwest to invest in the Company's hydro-electric  
2 facilities so as to enhance the surrounding environment and fish habitat without  
3 shifting costs to other States; and  
4 f) it permits Oregon to "opt-out" of supporting the costs of a future major coal-fired  
5 Resource that may give rise to policy concerns.

6 Mr. Duvall and Mr. Taylor provide additional detail as to how the MSP Solution deals  
7 with individual State initiatives in each of the aforementioned areas.

8 **Q. Does the MSP Solution permit continued effective regulatory oversight?**

9 A. Yes. The MSP Solution does not represent a substantial departure from past allocation  
10 practices in all of our jurisdictions. It incorporates elements of the "rolled-in" method that  
11 has been relied upon in Utah. A form of "Hydro Endowment" has been used by a number  
12 of our States for more than a decade. Perhaps most importantly, the MSP Solution is  
13 supported by an extraordinary level of analysis which should reduce the likelihood of  
14 unintended consequences.

15 **Q. Will the MSP Solution enhance the Company's ability to provide safe, adequate and**  
16 **reliable service?**

17 A. Absolutely. As described in Mr. MacRitchie's testimony, the Protocol will permit the  
18 Company to make needed, cost-effective investments in Resources and transmission with  
19 a reasonable degree of confidence that it will be able to recover 100 percent of its  
20 prudently incurred costs.

21 **Term of Protocol**

22 **Q. What is the proposed term of the Protocol?**

1 A. Section II of the Protocol provides that it will apply to all Company rate proceedings  
2 initiated subsequent to November 1, 2003. The Protocol does not provide for a  
3 termination date.

4 **Q. During the MSP, the Company and other parties expressed a strong interest in**  
5 **achieving a resolution to MSP issues that was “sustainable” through time. Does the**  
6 **MSP Solution accomplish this goal?**

7 A. Yes, although the Company continues to believe that the greatest level of sustainability  
8 would be obtained from a structural separation along jurisdictional lines, as proposed in  
9 our SRP filing. However, we understand that a number of parties were concerned that a  
10 structural separation, while “durable”, would commit State regulators to irreparable  
11 decisions that they could come to regret.

12 Mr. MacRitchie acknowledges in his direct testimony that ratification of the  
13 Protocol will not bind future Commissions or bar parties from challenging inter-  
14 jurisdictional cost allocations in future rate proceedings. This is somewhat unnerving for  
15 the Company. The sustainability of the Protocol rests upon an expectation that the same  
16 spirit of cooperation and good will among the parties that led to the MSP Solution will  
17 sustain it.

18 **Q. Were there lessons to be learned from the prior “PITA” process regarding the**  
19 **sustainability of inter-jurisdictional cost allocation principles?**

20 A. Yes. While the PITA process was valuable and produced nearly a decade of consensus, it  
21 ultimately proved ineffective because its participation was limited and because parties  
22 lost sight of the importance to the Company and its customers of maintaining a consensus  
23 on inter-jurisdictional issues. The MSP has enjoyed much broader participation. The



1 Protocol commits the Company to continue the process through at least annual meetings  
2 to consider changed circumstances and possible Protocol amendments. There is an  
3 important distinction between an understanding that is “static” and one that is  
4 “sustainable”. Continued dialog among the parties and amendments to the Protocol as  
5 required, will be critical to its long-term viability.

#### 6 **Allocation of Generation-Related Costs and Revenues**

7 **Q. How are generation-related costs and revenues to be allocated under the MSP**  
8 **Solution?**

9 A. This is provided for in Section IV of the Protocol. All generation Resources will be  
10 assigned to one of four categories for inter-jurisdictional cost allocation purposes and  
11 reflected on a cost-of-service basis. These categories are: a) “Seasonal Resources”, b)  
12 “Regional Resources”, c) “State Resources” and d) “System Resources”.

#### 13 **Seasonal Resources**

14 **Q. What are “Seasonal Resources”?**

15 A. The Protocol defines “Seasonal Resources” as: (a) a Simple-Cycle Combustion Turbine  
16 generating plant owned or leased by the Company, (b) any Seasonal Contract or c) the  
17 combination of Cholla Unit IV and the APS Exchange. Mr. Duvall’s testimony provides  
18 the details of the resources in this category and the rationale for their inclusion.

19 **Q. What is the basis for allocating the costs of Seasonal Resources?**

20 A. The different treatment is intended to gain a measure of precision and assure that costs are  
21 allocated equitably. We experience peak loads in Utah during summer months. We  
22 experience peak loads in Oregon during winter months. Seasonal Resources are acquired  
23 in large measure to meet these peak loads. Therefore, it appears equitable to allocate the

1 costs of Seasonal Resources in a manner that better reflects the seasonal peaking  
2 differences of our States.

3 **Q. How are the costs of Seasonal Resources to be allocated?**

4 A. Generally speaking, costs of Seasonal Resources are more heavily assigned to the months  
5 in which the Resource dispatches and, by extension, to the States with the greatest  
6 proportion of load on the system during those months. Mr. Taylor's direct testimony  
7 describes the allocation process in detail.

#### 8 **Regional Resources**

9 **Q. What are "Regional Resources"?**

10 A. The Protocol provides for three types of Regional Resources. These are: a) Hydro  
11 Endowment, b) Coal Endowment and c) the First Major New Coal Resource. This  
12 classification is driven by state or regional energy policy preferences and is for cost  
13 allocation purposes only. Costs of Regional Resources are also to be allocated on a  
14 dynamic basis, but with an initial assignment to two or more States based on policy  
15 preferences.

#### 16 *Hydro Endowment*

17 **Q. What are "Hydro-Electric Resources"?**

18 A. These are: a) the Company's owned hydro-electric facilities, b) contracts under which the  
19 Company purchases power from the "Mid-Columbia" projects and c) contracts entered  
20 into by PacifiCorp to directly amend or replace the Mid-Columbia contracts. Mr. Duvall's  
21 testimony provides the details of the resources in this category.

22 **Q. How are the costs of Hydro-Electric Resources to be allocated?**

23 A. Generally speaking, they are initially assigned to the former Pacific Power & Light

1 jurisdictions and then dynamically allocated among these States. Mr. Duvall discusses  
2 the form of the Hydro Endowment and Mr. Taylor's direct testimony provides details of  
3 the allocation process.

4 **Q. What is the basis for allocating the costs and benefits of Hydro-Electric Resources in**  
5 **this manner?**

6 A. The proposed difference in treatment arises from the principles of equity and facilitating  
7 individual State policy initiatives. Parties in Oregon and Washington feel very strongly  
8 that the benefits of Hydro-Electric Resources should flow to customers in the Northwest  
9 through a "Hydro Endowment" because that is where the generation is located and where  
10 hydro-electric facilities and the mitigation of their impact on fish have long been critical  
11 policy concerns. In addition, several parties feel that the former Pacific Power  
12 jurisdictions of Oregon, California, Washington and Wyoming have an entitlement to  
13 these historically low-cost resources because these Resources predated the 1989 Pacific  
14 Power/Utah Power merger.

15 Those same parties also acknowledge that the Pacific Northwest States should  
16 support all of the costs of these Resources (which is not the current practice). At the  
17 current time, many of the Company's Hydro-Electric Resources are in the process of  
18 FERC relicensing. As part of this relicensing, FERC is required to consider fish and  
19 wildlife, cultural, recreational, land-use and aesthetics issues equally with energy  
20 production needs. State and Federal agencies also have the authority to place mandatory  
21 conditions in new licenses and certification is required by the State Department of  
22 Ecology. Mandatory conditions from the States of Oregon, California and Washington  
23 may require investment in fish mitigation measures that exceeds the level with which our

1 other States would be comfortable. Treating Hydro-Resources as Regional Resources  
2 permits the Pacific Northwest States to make such policy choices and bear the costs of  
3 such choices without risk to our customers in other States.

4 *Coal Endowment*

5 **Q. Which Resource is included in the Coal Endowment?**

6 A. The Huntington Generating Station was selected for inclusion in the Coal Endowment.

7 **Q. How are the costs of the Huntington Generating Station to be allocated?**

8 A. They are initially assigned to the former Utah Power & Light jurisdictions and then  
9 dynamically allocated among these states. As discussed in Mr. Taylor's direct testimony,  
10 this allocation mirrors the allocation of the Hydro-electric Resources under the Hydro  
11 Endowment.

12 **Q. What is the basis for allocating the costs and benefits of the Huntington Generating  
13 Station in this manner?**

14 A. The same principles that support the basis of the Hydro Endowment – equity and  
15 facilitating individual State policy initiatives. The Huntington Generating Station is a  
16 low-cost Resource in Utah that pre-dates the 1989 Pacific Power/Utah Power merger. In  
17 addition, future investments in Clean Air initiatives will be influenced by state energy  
18 policy perspectives. As discussed in Mr. Duvall's testimony, the Coal Endowment  
19 proposal is coupled with the Hydro Endowment in a manner that also balances Resource  
20 output characteristics.

21 *First Major New Coal Resource*

22 **Q. What is "the First Major New Coal Resource"?**

1 A. This is defined in the Protocol as “the first Resource planned to be acquired by PacifiCorp  
2 subsequent to January 1, 2004 that: a) provides for more than 300 megawatts of capacity  
3 for at least 25 years and b) whose fuel source is principally coal”.

4 **Q. Is this necessarily a Company-owned Resource?**

5 A. No. The Company projects a substantial need for base-load capacity in the years ahead  
6 which will be met through a combination of Company-owned, rate-based Resources and  
7 contracts with third parties. The choice for any particular Resource will depend upon  
8 economic opportunities and circumstances prevailing at the time the Resource is  
9 committed to. Therefore, the “First Major New Coal Resource” may prove to be either a  
10 Company-owned plant or a third-party contract under which the bulk of the power is  
11 provided from one or more coal-fired plants.

12 **Q. What is the basis for allocating the costs of the First Major New Coal Resource?**

13 A. This is being proposed consistent with the principles of being responsive to individual  
14 State policy initiatives and equity. Policy makers and customer groups in Oregon have  
15 expressed concerns about our Oregon customers supporting the costs of a major new coal  
16 plant because of its perceived potential environmental consequences. Policy makers and  
17 customer representatives in other States have not expressed the same degree of concern  
18 regarding the potential environmental costs of a coal-fired plant. A major new coal  
19 Resource would represent a major financial commitment for the Company. Unless the  
20 philosophical differences are resolved among our States regarding a major new coal  
21 Resource, it would be difficult for the Company to make that commitment, with the result  
22 that costs could be increased for customers in States who have not expressed  
23 philosophical opposition to additional coal-fired generation.

1    **Q.    Is Oregon afforded an option of whether it will share in the costs and benefits of the**  
2           **First Major New Coal Resource?**

3    A.    Yes. Under the Protocol, Oregon is afforded a one-time irrevocable option to participate  
4           or not.

5    **Q.    Why is Oregon afforded this option?**

6    A.    This is an important decision for Oregon that should not be made on less than a full  
7           factual record or based upon the Company's inferences regarding Oregon policy  
8           preferences. However, we believe that it is also fair to customers in our other States and  
9           to the Company for Oregon to face this decision before the Resource is committed to and  
10          before its actual costs are known.

11   **Q.    What will be the forum for resolving the issue of whether Oregon will participate?**

12   A.    Pursuant to the Protocol, PacifiCorp will initiate a filing pursuant to ORS 757.212, the  
13          Oregon generation resource rate plan statute. This statute permits the Oregon  
14          Commission to make binding decisions regarding the rate method to be applied to  
15          proposed new Resources. We believe that a generation resource rate plan could be  
16          adopted pursuant to ORS 757.212 that provides that Oregon customers will support none  
17          of the costs and receive none of the benefits of the First Major New Coal Resource. Such  
18          a plan could alternately recognize that the First Major New Coal Resource should be  
19          treated as a System Resource.

20   **Q.    Will Oregon have a similar option for future coal-fired Resources that are proposed**  
21          **subsequent to the acquisition of the First Major New Coal Resource?**

22   A.    The Protocol does not provide for any such additional options.

1   **State Resources**

2   **Q.    What are State Resources?**

3   A.    State Resources consist of: a) Demand Side Management Programs and b) Portfolio  
4       Standards.

5   **Q.    What is the basis for assigning the costs of State Resources?**

6   A.    It is based upon the principles of being responsive to individual state policy initiatives  
7       and equity. State resources are driven by state-specific policy initiatives and should,  
8       therefore, not unfairly burden other States. The Protocol provides for direct or "situs"  
9       assignment of certain costs so as to insulate other States from actions taken by one State.

10   *Demand-Side Management Programs*

11   **Q.    How does the Company propose to allocate the costs and benefits of Demand-Side  
12       Management Programs?**

13   A.    Costs of these programs will be assigned on a situs basis to the State in which the  
14       investment is made. Benefits from these programs, in the form of reduced consumption,  
15       will be reflected through time in each state's Load-Based Dynamic Allocation Factors.

16   **Q.    Is this consistent with the Company's current practice?**

17   A.    Yes. The appropriate allocation of the costs and benefits of Demand-Side Management  
18       Programs was a topic at some of the earlier MSP meetings. Parties appeared to be  
19       satisfied that this approach permitted individual States to invest in the level of Demand-  
20       Side Management Programs that they deemed appropriate without unreasonably shifting  
21       costs or benefits to other States with different levels of Demand Side Management  
22       Program investment.

1 *Portfolio Standards*

2 **Q. What are Portfolio Standards?**

3 A. The Protocol defines "Portfolio Standards" as any "New State law or regulation that  
4 requires PacifiCorp to acquire: a) a particular type of Resource, b) a particular quantity of  
5 Resources c) Resources in a prescribed manner or d) Resources located in a particular  
6 geographic area".

7 **Q. Can you point to any examples of Portfolio Standards?**

8 A. Yes. Utah, California and Washington have considered legislation requiring utilities to  
9 purchase minimum quantities of renewable resources.

10 **Q. Does this mean that Portfolio Standards are limited to laws and regulations related**  
11 **to requirements to purchase renewable resources?**

12 A. No. It is entirely conceivable that a State could require the Company to acquire and  
13 locally site a non-renewable Resource for economic development purposes.

14 **Q. Are all Resources acquired as result of Portfolio Standards to be deemed "State**  
15 **Resources", with a situs assignment of all of their costs?**

16 A. No. Only the portion (if any) of the costs of such Resources that are disallowed in other  
17 States would be assigned on a situs basis.

18 **Q. Why do you say "if any"?**

19 A. There is no reason to assume that Resources acquired pursuant to Portfolio Standards will  
20 not be cost-effective and not properly subject to allocation as System Resources. Situs  
21 assignment should only occur if a State requires the Company to make an uneconomic  
22 investment. We expect this will be the exception rather than the rule.



1     **System Resources**

2     **Q.     What are “System Resources”?**

3     A.     System Resources constitute the substantial majority of PacifiCorp’s Resources. The  
4             Protocol defines “System Resources” as any Resources that are not “Seasonal  
5             Resources”, “Regional Resources” or “State Resources”.

6     **Q.     How are costs and revenues associated with System Resources to be allocated?**

7     A.     All costs and revenues associated with System Resources will be allocated on a dynamic  
8             basis based upon each State’s relative contribution to PacifiCorp’s system peak and  
9             energy requirements. Mr. Taylor presents the details of this proposal.

10    **Q.     What do you mean by your reference to an allocation being done on a “dynamic  
11             basis”?**

12    A.     I am referring to the practice of basing a State’s allocation of costs on its relative  
13             contribution to our capacity or energy requirements during the test period for which  
14             prices are being established. These allocations are “dynamic” because they change from  
15             year to year as the relative size and shape of loads in our various States change through  
16             time.

17    **Allocation of Special Contracts**

18    **Q.     What inter-jurisdictional cost allocation issues arise from Special Contracts?**

19    A.     Several of our large industrial customers are able to lower the cost of operating our  
20             system by curtailing their use of electricity when requested to do so by the Company. The  
21             availability of this curtailment right supports operating reserves, preserves system  
22             integrity during times of emergency and may permit us to avoid investing in new  
23             Resources that would be required if the industrial load was treated as “firm”. An inter-

1 jurisdictional cost allocation issue can arise as to whether the amount paid to the customer  
2 (either through a separate contracts or as a discount from tariff prices) represents  
3 excessive compensation for the curtailment rights that are provided.

4 **Q. Why should other States be concerned about the Special Contract discount being**  
5 **excessive?**

6 A. If the discount represents reasonable compensation for the Customer Ancillary Service  
7 Contract attributes of a Special Contract, it should be allocated to all States as a System  
8 Resource. However, if the discount is overly generous because the State approving the  
9 contract wishes to subsidize the industrial customer for economic development purposes,  
10 the subsidy amount should be assigned on a situs basis as a State Resource. In other  
11 words, States should be free to use electric rates as a means of subsidizing local economic  
12 development, but the costs of such subsidies should not be supported by customers in  
13 other States. Mr. Taylor's testimony addresses this issue in detail as well as the proposed  
14 resolution.

#### 15 **Allocation of the Gain or Loss from the Sale of Assets**

16 **Q. How does the MSP Solution deal with a sale of Resources and transmission assets**  
17 **that is unrelated to a Direct Access Program?**

18 A. Section IX of the Protocol provides that, for inter-jurisdictional allocation purposes, the  
19 gain or loss from such a sale will be allocated among the States on the basis of the  
20 allocation factor used to allocate the fixed costs of the asset at the time of its sale.

21 **Q. How will a State's share of the gain or loss from the sale of a Resource or**  
22 **transmission asset be allocated between customers and Company shareholders?**

1 A. The Protocol provides that this will be a matter for individual States to decide in the  
2 process of approving the sale.

3 **Industry Restructuring and Direct Access Programs**

4 **Q. Please explain some of the issues that Direct Access Programs create for a system of**  
5 **inter-jurisdictional cost allocations.**

6 A. To some extent, the precise nature of the issues depends on the nature of the Industry  
7 Restructuring Program that is adopted by a State. It is still unclear what direction the  
8 implementation of SB 1149 will take in Oregon and when or if other States will pursue  
9 Direct Access Programs of their own. However, the broad issues that need to be generally  
10 dealt with among the States in the context of Direct Access are: a) resolving inter-  
11 jurisdictional entitlement to and responsibility for the benefits and costs of Resources  
12 freed up by customers electing Direct Access and b) the valuation of Freed-Up Resources  
13 for purposes of assessing “stranded costs” and “stranded benefits”.

14 *Entitlement to Freed-Up Resources*

15 **Q. How do issues arise in respect to the inter-jurisdictional entitlement to and**  
16 **responsibility for the benefits and costs of Freed-Up Resources?**

17 A. A key element of the philosophy underlying Direct Access in Oregon (as reflected in the  
18 administrative rules implementing SB 1149) is that Direct Access Customers should  
19 receive the economic benefit if Freed-Up Resources prove to be less costly than  
20 prevailing market prices (a case of “stranded benefits”) and that they should bear the cost  
21 if Freed-Up Resources prove to be more costly than prevailing market prices (a case of  
22 “stranded costs”). For a utility operating in a single state, this policy is fairly  
23 straightforward to implement. For a multi-state utility, this policy introduces an

1 asymmetrical risk of multiple claims to the Company's low-cost Resources. This policy  
2 can also introduce uncertainty and risks for other states. The Company's proposal  
3 protects the other states from Direct Access Programs in one state through a "wall-off".

4 **Q. How does the MSP Solution propose to resolve this dilemma?**

5 A. Section X.A of the Protocol provides that the load of Direct Access Customers will  
6 continue to be treated as retail load in the State conducting the Direct Access Program for  
7 purposes of calculating all Load-Based Dynamic Allocation Factors related to Resource  
8 costs.

9 Section X.B of the Protocol further provides that the sales of Freed-Up Resources  
10 will be separately tracked and treated as a "State Resource" assigned on a situs basis to  
11 the State conducting the Direct Access Program. Similarly Section X.C of the Protocol  
12 provides that any losses or gains on wholesale market purchases made by the Company  
13 on behalf of Direct Access Customers will be treated as a State Resource and assigned on  
14 a situs basis. Mr. Duvall's direct testimony describes this process in greater detail.

15 Collectively, these provisions insure that if a State adopts a Direct Access  
16 Program, other States will be neither benefited nor burdened by it. The effect of this  
17 provision is to contain all stranded costs and all stranded benefits associated with Freed-  
18 Up Resources within the State conducting the Direct Access Program. The allocation of  
19 those stranded benefits and stranded costs among customer classes then becomes a policy  
20 issue to be resolved by the State conducting the Direct Access Program.

21 *Ongoing valuation of Freed-Up Resources*

22 **Q. Please describe the inter-jurisdictional issues arising from the valuation of Freed-Up**  
23 **Resources that you referenced earlier in your testimony.**

1 A. Any Direct Access Program has to somehow deal with the calculation of stranded costs  
2 and stranded benefits prior to the allocation of those costs or benefits among customer  
3 classes. In order to calculate stranded costs and stranded benefits, one needs at least three  
4 pieces of information: a) an identification of which of the Company's Resources have  
5 been freed-up by Direct Access Customers, b) the embedded costs of the Freed-Up  
6 Resources that are identified and c) the market value of the Freed-Up Resources that are  
7 identified. For a utility like PacifiCorp serving in multiple jurisdictions, these issues  
8 cannot be resolved in a single-State vacuum without the concurrence of the other States.

9 **Q. Why not?**

10 A. Again, my response will reference provisions of administrative rules implementing SB  
11 1149 in Oregon, but I believe the same issues would arise under any State's Direct  
12 Access Program.

13 The Oregon SB 1149 administrative rules contemplate that initially, stranded costs  
14 and stranded benefits will be measured through a process referred to as "ongoing  
15 valuation". Under this process, it is assumed that Direct Access Customers were  
16 previously served from a uniform "slice" of the system resources allocated to Oregon.  
17 Thus, the embedded cost of Freed-Up Resources is calculated (taking into account load  
18 factor differences) as a proportion of the total generation costs allocated to Oregon. Under  
19 the ongoing valuation method, power freed up from direct access is sold into short-term  
20 wholesale markets. The revenues from these sales are then compared to the calculated  
21 embedded cost of the Freed-Up Resources to determine stranded costs or stranded  
22 benefits that are either payable by Direct Access Customers or paid to Direct Access  
23 Customers.

1    **Q.    Why do other States have an interest in this ongoing valuation process?**

2    A.    A number of complex issues are presented from an inter-jurisdictional perspective. First,  
3           the ongoing valuation process assumes agreement as to what resources are being allocated  
4           to Oregon. Parties in Oregon cannot reasonably claim an entitlement to revenues from  
5           Freed-Up Resources if it is not supporting the full costs of those Resources in the first  
6           instance. If different States rely upon different inter-jurisdictional allocation methods,  
7           there is no means of achieving consensus regarding the embedded costs of Freed-Up  
8           Resources in Oregon. Second, traditionally, all States have been allocated an  
9           undifferentiated share of PacifiCorp's total revenues from short-term sales. The Oregon  
10          ongoing valuation process requires both that some of the Company's short-term sales be  
11          separately "color-coded" as being associated with the sale of power from Freed-Up  
12          Resources and it requires that revenues associated with such sales be assigned on a situs  
13          basis and not allocated to other States.

14   **Q.    How does the MSP Solution resolve issues associated with the Oregon ongoing**  
15   **valuation process?**

16   A.    It does the following:

- 17          a) it provides for an inter-jurisdictional cost allocation system which is accepted by all  
18             States, thereby permitting a common understanding of what embedded Resource costs  
19             are being borne by Oregon;
- 20          b) it provides for separate tracking of short-term sales made from Freed-Up Resources  
21             and provides for their situs assignment to Oregon as "State Resources";
- 22          c) by relying upon total Oregon delivered load (which includes load being served by  
23             energy service suppliers) for the purpose of calculating Load-Based Dynamic

1 Allocation Factors, Oregon is assured of its ability to recover the same share of  
2 revenues from short-term sales that are unrelated to Direct Access that it would  
3 receive if it did not have a Direct Access Program; and

4 d) by relying upon total Oregon distribution load for the purpose of calculating Load-  
5 Based Dynamic Allocation Factors, it assures other States that Oregon is supporting  
6 the same share of system Resource costs that it would in the absence of a Direct  
7 Access Program.

8 Again, these provisions collectively insure that other States will neither be benefited nor  
9 burdened by Oregon's ongoing valuation process.

10 *One-time Valuation of Freed-Up Resources*

11 **Q. Earlier, you testified that the SB 1149 administrative rules contemplated that the**  
12 **ongoing valuation process would be used "initially". What subsequent process did**  
13 **the rules contemplate?**

14 **A.** Many of those involved in drafting the SB 1149 administrative rules believed that the  
15 ongoing valuation method was flawed and needed to be replaced by a "one-time"  
16 valuation method as soon as practicable.

17 **Q. How was the "one-time" valuation method expected to work?**

18 **A.** A cornerstone of the one-time valuation method is PacifiCorp's preparation of a "resource  
19 plan" which would be subject to Oregon Commission approval. In the resource plan,  
20 PacifiCorp would describe all of its Oregon-allocated resources and propose:

21 a) which of its freed-up Oregon Resources should be dedicated to serving non-Direct  
22 Access Customers (residential and small commercial) on a cost-of-service basis; and

1           b) which freed-up Oregon Resources should be either sold or “administratively-valued”  
2           and deregulated.

3           As the name implies, it was contemplated that the process would result in a one-time,  
4           permanent determination of the stranded benefit entitlement or stranded cost obligation of  
5           Direct Access Customers.

6           In respect to Freed-Up Resources dedicated to serving remaining cost-of-service  
7           customers, payments of stranded benefits would be made by cost-of-service customers  
8           and payments of stranded costs would be credited to cost-of-service customers. In respect  
9           to Freed-Up Resources that were to be sold or administratively valued and deregulated,  
10          payments of stranded benefits would be effectively made by PacifiCorp shareholders and  
11          payments of stranded costs would be effectively paid to PacifiCorp shareholders.

12   **Q.   Why do other States have an interest in this one-time valuation process?**

13   **A.**   The issues for other states (as well as PacifiCorp’s shareholders) are legion. The one-time  
14          valuation process appears to assume that there is a fixed share of Resources assigned to  
15          Oregon and that a fixed portion of that share can be deemed to be freed up and valued  
16          once and for all. In fact, under the traditional approach to inter-jurisdictional allocations,  
17          no State is afforded a fixed share of PacifiCorp’s system. Instead, shares of cost  
18          responsibility and entitlement to benefits change from year to year based upon each  
19          State’s relative contribution to system peak and energy requirements.

20          Because it appears that Oregon’s loads are not expected to grow as rapidly as  
21          those in other States, Oregon’s claim to a fixed share of the Company’s resources would  
22          be problematic. Selling Freed-Up resources as a means of valuing them can only work if  
23          other States approve those sales. Similarly, “deregulating” Freed-Up Resources following



1 an administrative determination of their value only works if other States recognize that  
2 the Resources have been “deregulated” and not available to serve their cost-of-service  
3 customers.

4 **Q. Is a one-time valuation process likely to occur soon in Oregon?**

5 A. Although a one-time valuation process is still provided for in the SB 1149 administrative  
6 rules, it is highly uncertain as to when, if ever, the Oregon Commission will require the  
7 Company to file a resource plan and begin the one-time valuation process.

8 **Q. Why is that?**

9 A. A one-time valuation requires that some or all PacifiCorp customers who are eligible for  
10 Direct Access irrevocably commit to never again purchase electricity from the Company  
11 based upon cost-of-service prices. Because of concerns about a lack of market liquidity  
12 and concerns regarding the availability of reasonable transmission access, we have had no  
13 customers volunteering to permanently leave the system and the Oregon Commission  
14 appears presently unlikely to conscript anyone.

15 **Q. If the Oregon Commission undertook to implement a one-time valuation process,  
16 how would it be dealt with under the MSP Solution?**

17 A. The MSP Solution resolves most, but not all, issues that could arise under a one-time  
18 valuation. By ratifying the Protocol, we believe that Oregon would be acknowledging that  
19 it is not entitled to a fixed share of the Company’s resources, without specific  
20 concurrence of the other States. By relying upon total Oregon distribution load for the  
21 purpose of calculating Load-Based Dynamic Allocation Factors, the Protocol assures  
22 Oregon that the costs and benefits of some amount of Freed-Up Resources will be  
23 allocated to it. However, this amount will change over time based upon the loads of

1 Direct Access Customers relative to the loads of PacifiCorp customers in other States. It  
2 appears feasible for the Oregon Commission to administrative value a dynamic quantity  
3 of Freed-Up Resources and either dedicate those Resources to cost-of-service customers  
4 or deem them to be “deregulated”. It also appears feasible for the Oregon Commission to  
5 approve the long-term fixed-price sale of a dynamic quantity of power from Freed-Up  
6 Resources if a buyer could be found for such a proposition. Most problematic is an asset  
7 sale as a means of one-time valuation that would have to be approved by the other States.

8 **Q. What does the Protocol provide in respect to such an asset sale?**

9 A. Section X.B of the Protocol provides that the other States would review such a sale on the  
10 basis of a “no-harm” standard.

11 **Loss or Increase in Load**

12 **Q. Does the Protocol contains provisions related to a material gain or loss of retail load**  
13 **in a State?**

14 A. Yes, this is provided for in Section XI of the Protocol. Under the MSP Solution, if a State  
15 experiences a gain or loss of load arising from condemnation or municipalization of  
16 Company service territory, sale or acquisition of new service territory (less than 5 percent  
17 of system load), realignment of service territories, changes in economic conditions or the  
18 gain or loss of large customers, the gain or loss will be reflected as changes in the Load-  
19 Based Dynamic Allocation Factors.

20 **Q. Suppose the Company proposes to acquire or merge with another utility that greatly**  
21 **increases its load in a State?**

22 A. The Protocol recognizes that such major transactions will continue to be subject to  
23 Commission review and approval pursuant to applicable State law. Allocation issues

1 arising from such transactions will be dealt with on a case-by-case basis as part of the  
2 Commission approval process.

### 3 **Sustainability of Protocol**

4 **Q. You have previously mentioned the issue of the “sustainability” of the MSP Solution.**  
5 **Please describe the provisions of the Protocol that are designed to make it**  
6 **sustainable.**

7 A. Sustainability provisions are contained in Section XIII of the Protocol. The first topic  
8 dealt with is “issues of interpretation”. Inevitably, with the passage of time, unanticipated  
9 issues will emerge and new parties will be involved in Company regulatory proceedings  
10 who did not have the benefit of participation in the MSP and these proceedings. The  
11 Protocol provides that if issues of Protocol interpretation arise, there will be an attempt to  
12 resolve them with reference to testimony offered in proceedings associated with the  
13 ratification of the Protocol and Commission ratification orders. We wish to have as full a  
14 record as possible in these proceedings explaining what is intended by the Protocol  
15 provisions. The Protocol further provides for the establishment of an MSP Standing  
16 Committee consisting of one member of each Commission. At least once each calendar  
17 year, the Company will convene a meeting of the MSP Standing Committee and  
18 interested parties for the purpose of discussing emerging inter-jurisdictional issues facing  
19 the Company and considering possible amendments to the Protocol that would be  
20 equitable to PacifiCorp customers in all States and to the Company. The MSP Standing  
21 Committee could also commission studies, appoint subcommittees or take other actions to  
22 determine how best to encourage consensus among states.

23 **Q. What will be the process for amending the Protocol?**

1     A.     PacifiCorp will submit proposed amendments to Commissions for ratification. The  
2           Protocol will be deemed amended if all the Commissions who originally ratified the  
3           Protocol ratify the amendment. The Protocol provides that PacifiCorp will not seek  
4           Commission ratification of an amendment unless and until it has provided interested  
5           parties with at least six months advance notice of its intent to do so and endeavored to  
6           obtain consensus regarding the proposed amendment. The Protocol also provides that,  
7           prior to departing from the terms of the Protocol, and consistent with their legal  
8           obligations, Commissions will endeavor to cause their concerns to be presented at  
9           meetings of interested parties from all States in an attempt to achieve a proposed  
10          resolution of those concerns.

11    **Conclusion**

12    **Q.     Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

13    A.     Yes it does.